



03 MAR 2004

#14

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
P.O. Box 1450  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

MERCHANT & GOULD PC  
P.O. BOX 2903  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

In re Application of COMBELLES et al :  
U.S. Application No.: 09/446,958 :  
PCT Application No.: PCT/FR98/01398 :  
Int. Filing Date: 30 June 1998 : DECISION  
Priority Date Claimed: 01 July 1997 :  
Attorney Docket No.: 09320.0092USWO :  
For: MULTICARRIER MODULATION USING :  
WEIGHTED PROTOTYPE FUNCTIONS :  
:

This is in response to applicant's "Petition Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.47(a)" filed 19 August 2002.

**BACKGROUND**

On 30 June 1998, applicant filed international application PCT/FR98/01398, which claimed priority of an earlier France application filed 01 July 1997. A copy of the international application was communicated to the USPTO from the International Bureau on 14 January 1999. A Demand for international preliminary examination, in which the United States was elected, was filed on 08 January 1999, prior to the expiration of nineteen months from the priority date. Accordingly, the thirty-month period for paying the basic national fee in the United States expired on 01 January 2000.

On 29 December 1999, applicant filed national stage papers in the United States Designated/Elected Office (DO/EO/US). The submission was accompanied by, *inter alia*, the basic national fee required by 35 U.S.C. 371(c)(1).

On 08 March 2000, the DO/EO/US mailed a Notification of Missing Requirements Under 35 U.S.C. 371 (Form PCT/DO/EO/905), which indicated that an oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.497 must be filed.

On 07 August 2000, applicant filed a declaration executed by two of the three joint inventors.

On 28 August 2000, the DO/EO/US mailed a Notification of Acceptance of Application Under 35 U.S.C. 371 (Form PCT/DO/EO/903).

On 19 August 2002, applicant filed the present petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a).

### DISCUSSION

A petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a) must be accompanied by: (1) an oath or declaration by each applicant on his or her own behalf and on behalf of the nonsigning joint inventors, (2) factual proof that the missing joint inventors refuse to join in the application or cannot be reached after diligent effort, (3) the fee set forth in §1.17(i), and (4) the last known addresses of the nonsigning joint inventors.

With regard to item (1) above, applicant has submitted a declaration signed by the available inventors, each on his/her own behalf and on behalf of the nonsigning inventor Jalali Ali.

With regard to item (2) above, MPEP 409.03(d) states in relevant part,

Where inability to find or reach a nonsigning inventor "after diligent effort" is the reason for filing under 37 CFR 1.47, an affidavit or declaration of facts should be submitted which fully describes the exact facts which are relied on to establish that a diligent effort was made. . . . The affidavit or declaration of facts must be signed, where at all possible, by a person having firsthand knowledge of the facts recited therein. Statements based on hearsay will not normally be accepted. Copies of documentary evidence such as certified mail return receipt, cover letter of instructions, telegrams, etc., that support a finding that the nonsigning inventor could not be found or reached should be made part of the affidavit or declaration. It is important that the affidavit or declaration contain statements of fact as opposed to conclusions.

\* \* \*

Where a refusal to sign the application papers is alleged, the circumstances of this refusal must be specified in an affidavit or declaration by the person to whom the refusal was made. Statements by a party not present when an oral refusal is made will not be accepted.

Before a refusal can be alleged, it must be demonstrated that a bona fide attempt was made to present a copy of the application papers (specification, including claims, drawings, and oath or declaration) to the nonsigning inventor for signature. A copy of the application papers should be sent to the last known address of the nonsigning inventor, or, if the nonsigning inventor is represented by counsel, to the address of the nonsigning inventor's attorney.

When there is an express oral refusal, that fact along with the time and place of the refusal must be stated in the affidavit or declaration. When there is an express written refusal, a copy of the document evidencing that refusal must be made part of the affidavit or declaration.

When it is concluded by the 37 CFR 1.47 applicant that a nonsigning inventor's conduct constitutes a refusal, all facts upon which that conclusion is based should be stated in the affidavit or declaration. If there is documentary evidence to support facts alleged in the affidavit or declaration, such evidence should be submitted. Whenever a nonsigning inventor gives a reason for refusing to sign the application oath or declaration, that reason should be stated in the affidavit or declaration.

The present petition fails to state whether inventor Ali refuses to sign the application papers or cannot be located. Applicant is required to specify whether the nonsigning inventor refuses to sign the application papers or cannot be located. If a refusal to sign is alleged, applicant has not demonstrated that a bona fide attempt was made to present a complete copy of the application papers to Ali for signature. Furthermore, no details of a refusal have been provided. If applicant alleges that Ali cannot be located, sufficient evidence of a diligent effort to reach Ali has not been submitted. Specifically, applicant has not provided details of any attempt to contact Ali by telephone or electronic mail, by trying to reach Ali through his employer, co-workers, family, or friends, or by trying to obtain a current mailing address for Ali. Thus it would not be reasonable to conclude at the present time that Ali cannot be located or refuses to sign.

With regard to item (3) above, applicant has provided the requisite petition fee.

With regard to item (4) above, the petition states the last known address of the nonsigning inventor.

### CONCLUSION

For the reasons above, the petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a) is DISMISSED without prejudice.

The Notification of Acceptance of Application Under 35 U.S.C. 371 (Form PCT/DO/EO/903) mailed 28 August 2000 is hereby VACATED.

If reconsideration on the merits of this petition is desired, a proper response must be filed within TWO (2) MONTHS from the mail date of this decision. Extensions of time are available under 37 CFR 1.136(a). Failure to timely file a proper response will result in abandonment of the application. Any reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition Under 37 CFR 1.47(a)". No additional petition fee is required.

Please direct further correspondence with respect to this matter to Mail Stop PCT, Commissioner for Patents, Office of PCT Legal Administration, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450, with the contents of the letter marked to the attention of the Office of PCT Legal Administration.



Bryan Tung  
PCT Legal Examiner  
PCT Legal Office

Telephone: 703-308-6614  
Facsimile: 703-308-6459